

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Advisory Action dated June 13, 2005 refusing entry of the Amendment dated May 31, 2005. The Advisory Action indicates the Amendment to raise new issues that would require further search and to not otherwise place the application in better form for appeal.

Background

This application was transferred to Examiner Fortuna at this time. Following a lengthy examination with Examiner Alvo, the application was believed in condition for allowance, but for an accuracy problem in the claim language. The Amendment was therefore submitted to correct the accuracy of the claim language and otherwise clarify the same. As discussed below, no further or additional claim limitations are presented in the Amendment and it should be entered to place the case in condition for allowance and/or better form for appeal since it corrects the language accuracy problem.

The present invention is directed to a process for stabilizing the pH of a pulp suspension during stock preparation and the formation of paper. To that end, the alkalinity or buffering ability (see page 3 of the specification for the equivalency of these expressions) of the suspension is increased by the addition of amounts of

alkali metal hydroxide and carbon dioxide feeds in excess of those needed for merely adjusting the pH to the desired value.

The following remarks make reference to amended claim 1 as presented in the Amendment. Claim 1 is illustrative of the amendments proposed in the other independent claims and the following remarks are also applicable to all of the claims.

The Advisory Action

The Advisory Action indicates new issues to result from the amended claim limitations reciting buffering ability and the increasing of the pH of the pulp suspension. Each of these limitations is discussed below.

The buffering ability phrase was substituted for the term "alkalinity" at line 3 of claim 1. The phrase was presented in order to remove any doubt as to the meaning of the previously used term "alkalinity" and, therefore, does not raise a new issue. As the Examiner is well aware, alkalinity refers to buffering ability and not mere pH, as confirmed in the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the specification.

Therefore, the buffering ability limitation does not raise a new issue. And, in fact, to the extent someone may

erroneously confuse alkalinity with mere pH, the phrase avoids any such possible confusion, improves the clarity of the claim and thereby places the case in better condition for appeal.

The use of "alkalinity" or "buffering ability" is a non-issue since one skilled in the art may be expected to know the definition of alkalinity. Accordingly, applicants will agree to the use of either to gain entry of the amendment and the Examiner's is authorized to forego this change if the amendment is otherwise deemed acceptable to be entered.

The amendment at lines 7-9 of claim 1 is responsive to Examiner Alvo's challenge of the clarity of the prior language. More particularly, the language previously described the cooperation of the feeds to increase the buffering or alkalinity of the pulp in the following terms: "which cooperate without separate uses of their respective intermediate pH adjusting effects". This prior language is shown in claim 1 of the amendment. Mr. Alvo challenged the accuracy of the language and specifically observed:

The acid and basic effect counter each other with separate uses of their pH effect; they do not 'cooperate without separate uses of their

respective intermediate pH adjusting effects'
emphasis added.

Mr. Alvo's construction of the language was not challenged, but rather, the claim was amended to acknowledge that the feeds "cooperate to increase the pH of said pulp suspension and to otherwise only counter each other's pH adjusting effects without further separate uses of their respective intermediate pH adjusting effects." This clarification is responsive to the cited inaccuracy.

In the clarification of the cited inaccuracy, it is appropriate to acknowledge the increasing of the pH since it is distinguished from "further separate uses" in direct response to the Mr. Alvo's criticism. However, the increasing pH limitation is already contained in the claim, although at a different line location. For example, claim 1, lines 13-19, provide:

 said feeds being provided in an amount sufficient to achieve a significant buffering effect of said pulp suspension and to increase the pH of said pulp suspension and maintain the pH at a desired level from the addition of the feeds throughout the short circulation and formation of the paper on the paper machine.

This is the same increase in pH referenced at lines 7-9 of claim 1, and does not comprise a new limitation.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Amendment dated May 31, 2005 be entered since it does not raise new issues and it places the claims in condition for allowance and/or better form for appeal.

If there are any fees required by this communication, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 32107.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Joseph J. Corso, Reg. No. 25845

1801 East Ninth Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108

(216) - 579-1700

July 5, 2005